

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ERIN ASHLEY SAULS,  
Plaintiff,

v.

COMPUTERSHARE INC.,  
Defendant.

No. 2:24-cv-03164-DAD-AC

ORDER RELATING AND REASSIGNING  
CASE

ERIN ASHLEY SAULS,  
Plaintiff,

v.

COMPUTERSHARE, INC.,  
Defendant.

No. 2:25-cv-00048-DC-AC

**New Case No. 2:25-cv-00048-DAD-AC**


An examination of the above-captioned actions reveals that they are related within the meaning of Local Rule 123(a). Accordingly, assignment of the above-captioned actions to the same district judge and magistrate judge will promote substantial efficiency and economy for the court and is likely to be convenient for the parties.

An order relating cases under this court's Local Rule 123 merely assigns them to the same district judge and magistrate judge—it does not consolidate the cases. The local rules of this district authorize the judge with the lowest numbered case to order the reassignment of any higher

1 numbered cases to himself or herself, upon determining that this assignment is likely to effect a  
2 savings of judicial effort. L.R. 123(c). Such good cause appearing here, the court orders that  
3 Case No. 2:25-cv-00048-DC-AC is reassigned to the undersigned and Magistrate Judge Allison  
4 Claire. The caption on documents filed in the reassigned case shall be shown as: 2:25-cv-00048-  
5 DAD-AC. It is further ordered that the Clerk of the Court make appropriate adjustment in the  
6 assignment of civil cases to compensate for this reassignment.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: February 2, 2025

  
9 \_\_\_\_\_  
10 DALE A. DROZD  
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28